



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"One noticeable peculiarity in Caxton's anglicizing of the *Curial* is the habit of rendering some of the words of the original by two consecutive synonyms, one of them being the very word of Chartier, the other a more generally accepted English word." Examples follow.

In the *Eneydos* Mr. Culley says:

"On the whole, Caxton adhered faithfully to his original, as in the latter part of the Prologue he states he has done, but he often puts two words for one, and the language of the '*Eneydos*' is frequently turgid and exaggerated, epithets being heaped on epithets in a marvellous and bewildering manner, and the tautological repetition of words is wonderful." Examples follow.

"With regard to Caxton's style, its main feature is the *tiresome tautology*, which is apparently produced by the translator's desire to make as much as he could of his work, to render it as showy as possible. . . .

This appears first in the choice of words. Generally, one French expression is rendered by two consecutive synonyms; sometimes the first of these is the word of the original, sometimes another; sometimes one is French and the other Saxon; sometimes one strange the other familiar." Examples follow.

The first and third of these I have been unable to collate with the original. The second has been carefully collated by Dr. Furnival (see pp. 188-214 of *Eneydos*). A comparison of this collation with Caxton's translation shows that, in addition to what is stated above by Mr. Culley, a very large number, of the 'pairs,' perhaps the largest number, are in the original French. This suggests another explanation of the occurrence of word-pairs in certain translations.

I have no time to continue the investigation at present, but would suggest that such an investigation should take up the following points among others:

1. How frequent is the habit of using word-pairs in the older writers of our literature?
2. How far is it found in translations and how far in original works?
3. Is the ultimate origin of the habit explained by Dr. Kellner's dictum in '*Historical Outlines of English Syntax*' (p. 21): "Tautology is the natural vehicle of emphatic speech"?

OLIVER FARRER EMERSON.

Cornell University.

ROMANCE VERSIFICATION.

Grundriss der romanischen Philologie. II.

Band, 1. Abteilung. *Romanische Verslehre.*

Von EDMUND STENGEL. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner. 1893.

THE publication of Gröber's '*Grundriss*' was suspended, as our readers are aware, for financial reasons, the support not having been what was hoped for. The editors had then completed the first volume which dealt with philology pure and simple. The various articles on literature, which were already on hand, were obliged to await the appearance of more favorable conditions. These seem to have come at the present time, and with the beginning of the current year two new divisions of the '*Grundriss*' were issued from the Strasburg press. The link which connects the two main subjects, philology and literature, is the study of versification, and, accordingly, we find at the opening of the new series Stengel's exposition of the structure of Romance poetry. This article, its author states, has been in manuscript since 1887, and has been modified since that time only where it was necessary. So it is clear that the intervening years have not changed the views he held at first, but have rather given him leisure to fix them clearly in his own mind. This fact added to the natural qualities of his style makes Stengel's contribution unusual for directness and condensation, qualities which, to be sure, do not pass so strongly for merits in the eyes of your reviewer, at least. For to further condense what his pen has put in so compact a form, or even merely to outline the theories and facts presented, is possible only by omissions of minor conclusions, which are hardly less interesting and suggestive than those which are retained.

Stengel starts out by calling attention to the lack of general treatises on Romance versification. His own would be the first attempt to arrange the principal laws which it observes, and to indicate the most important exceptions to them. He also insists on the fact that we must discard all ideas of interference from outside in the development of Romance poetry, and all notions that the verse of one nation of the Latin race is fundamentally different from

that of another. On the contrary, all Romance poetry has one and the same origin. Following these statements comes an extended bibliography of the subject, in compiling which Stengel finds no satisfactory treatise on either modern Provençal or Roumanian poetry. Most of the authors cited, also, have considered only French poetical literature, whence has arisen a great one-sidedness, both in arguments and citations. And also it cannot be said that the majority of students have arrived, as yet, at any general principles on which to found their work. So Stengel proposes to prepare the way for a survey of the whole territory, and to settle in this present outline only the determining rules of poetry. In so doing he is often forced to mark out his own course, from the dearth of competent predecessors.

What are then, he asks, the principles of Romance versification? By a study of the text of the French "Ste. Eulalie" he sees that the attempt of its author to imitate the meter of its Latin original, has not resulted in a complete disregard for the rhythmical principle of the vernacular. So "Ste. Eulalie" would, in his opinion, be made up of fourteen assonanced lines, in two strophes, would vary from the Latin poem, of one strophe, in the number of syllables in a line, and would be most like a Romance ballad in form. As this poem is the earliest specimen of Romance verse the conclusions at which he arrives regarding it have much weight in what follows.

To consider first the question of accent in the Romance line. This is not, as in some modern languages, an insistence on a fixed number of accented syllables, and an introduction of any number of unaccented syllables in a given verse, but rather an accent limited by a certain number of syllables in a line, tonic and atonic, which follow one another in regular alternation. That is, Stengel claims that the underlying principle is not so much accent as it is a fixed number of syllables, which allow one or two extra syllables at the cesura and the end of the verse. Thus, in Romance poetry, word-accent is rejected in favor of a regular number of stressed syllables in a verse, and an equal number in the conjoined verses. There may be only one stress,

as in the shorter lines, or two or more, as in the longer ones. In the first instance, the stress comes at the end of the verse; in the second, at the end and within the verse as well, at its various rhythmical divisions. From this usage it is evident that the long verses are combinations of shorter verses, or rhythmical divisions. Further, the rhythm is a falling or a rising one, according as an even or odd number of syllables precedes the tonic syllable. Also the stressed syllable is in no way affected by the extra syllable at the end of the verse or at the cesura.

In consequence of this constant law of verse-accent there arises naturally a conflict between it and the word-accent, and from this conflict proceeds that multiplicity of poetical forms, which is the great contribution of Romance versification to literature. Yet Stengel's position in regard to the regularity of verse-accent is not without its adversaries, who are neither few in number nor mean in authority. They claim that consecutive lines in the same poem may have an unequal number of stresses, though of the same length, and that each division of the verse varies in length with the taste of the poet. To which Stengel rejoins that this view of the matter is the result of deductions based on an unnatural way of speaking, which is to-day in fashion among the French. So one principle of Romance versification would be a fixed number of syllables before the accent at the end of the verse, or at the end of each rhythmical element in the verse. In early times a verse had thus three and even four accents, but later the principle of verse-accent became modified, and weakened until it even disappeared, as in the Italian hendeca-syllable.

A second principle of Romance versification is one which has no gainsayers, namely, the requirement of rime or assonance between the last tonic syllables of two or more verses. Later this law was extended so as to require a similarity in sound between the final syllables also, that is, the extra syllables following the tonic. Blank verse to be sure has been tried, under the influence of Latin metrical poetry, but in Italy alone has the attempt been crowned with success. Consonance between words, as in such a list as *mille-belle-spille*, is rarely

met with outside of the artistic poetry of Italy, and other forms of correspondence in sound are quite infrequent and almost wholly restricted to Italian and Provençal juggleries in verse.

So much for the two principles of Romance versification. The next question to be considered is the problem of the origin of the verse itself. Here Stengel agrees with Gaston Paris and finds, with him, that the Romance line is the direct and lawful descendant of Latin popular poetry, and was represented in the early literature of Rome by the Saturnian verse. Therefore, all attempts to derive typical Romance verses from Latin metrical lines of corresponding length he looks upon as fruitless. For Stengel believes that there was a popular versification among the Romans which was based on accent, because, in the specimens of popular poetry handed down to us, the verse-accent and word-accent coincide much more frequently than they do in the earliest Latin metrical poetry, and also because in the remote ages of Latin poetry alliteration was much used. This indigenous popular poetry would be in course of time somewhat affected by the classical meters, and the principle of word-accent would be weakened until, reduced to the two chief accents in the verse which we know to-day, it would change to the principle of a fixed member of syllables before the remaining accents.

To test this view Stengel takes up the much tormented verse of ten syllables. In its earliest form it shows the presence of an extra syllable at the cesura and at the end of the verse, which could easily fall away in the changes of pronunciation without injuring the rhythm of the verse. Thus this earliest form of the ten syllable verse would be, in fact, a line of twelve syllables, having accents at the sixth (or fourth) and eleventh syllables. This verse would in turn find a model in the prehistoric fourteen syllable verse, having accents on the sixth and twelfth. In shortening these original lines, pronunciation has been the chief agent. French and Provençal words have become oxytonic and paroxytonic, while Spanish and Italian retain the proparoxytones of the Latin. Popular Latin shows proparoxytones. But in French and Provençal there are

still traces of the proparoxytones, as in the mediæval words *aneme* and *sapiencia*. Cielo d'Alcamo's 'Contrasto' is proparoxytonic, as are also the old Spanish twelve syllable verse and the early Portuguese poetry.

Now the prehistoric line of fourteen syllables, the original of all these later forms, can be separated into two short lines, one of eight syllables with accented sixth, and one of six syllables having the fourth syllable stressed. (Stengel considers the ten syllable verse having an accented sixth as earlier than the ten syllable with accented fourth.) Now the form of this prehistoric verse in literature would be the Saturnian which, according to Thurneysen, is based on word-accent and contains five such accents. The verse is then divided by a cesura into halves. The first half would contain three accents and the second two. Of these accents the first would come on the first syllable of the line, the third on next to the last syllable of the first half, or on the syllable preceding it, and the fifth accent on next to the last syllable of the whole line, or on the one preceding it. Under the influence of quantitative meter, the accent gradually deserted the first syllable of the verse for the second, and by so doing, lost its former preëminence. So the weight of verse-accent must have tended more and more towards the end of the rhythmical divisions, as in the later Romance verse, and from this tendency came a rising inflection in the verse rather than a falling. Afterwards the law of a fixed number of syllables before the tonic gradually acquired authority and gave the verse a new sound. So according as the poet employed before the tonic syllable an even or an odd member of syllables, his verse had a falling or a rising inflection. The weakening of the first accent in favor of the last brought about, in popular poetry, verses of an even number of syllables as a rule, though lines containing an odd number are still found.

This gradual change in the Latin popular verse and its Romance descendants took place not in France alone, as has been usually supposed, but over all the Romance territory. The ten syllable verse is the legitimate heir of the Saturnian, and is, therefore, like its ancestor, merely another form of the Indo-European

long line. In regard to Romance verses of a less number of syllables than ten, Stengel pursues the same method. The verse of eight syllables had at first a very marked accent on the fourth, as well as on the eighth syllable, and, therefore, is of popular origin. So is also the verse of twelve syllables having accents on the fourth, eighth and twelfth, thus revealing three original rhythmical elements. The verse of fourteen syllables would go back to an ancestor in the popular Latin and is, therefore, not a product of later rhythmical poetry nor, as has been argued, is it a union of two lines of seven syllables each. The eleven syllable verse would have the Latin tetrameter as its source, and the nine syllable verse would be merely a shortening of the verse of eleven syllables. The ten syllable having an accent on the fifth would be also of learned origin, coming from the trochaic tetrameter of the Romans. Thus both popular and classical lines would be imitated in their Romance successors. In like manner assonance and rime are legacies of Latin popular poetry. Assonance shows that the accent had already been weakened, and that some device was necessary to make poetical forms more evident to the ear.

Passing from the origin of the various Romance verses to their use by the poets, Stengel shows that they are divided into two classes, one having a rising rhythm, the other a falling one. Of the lines having the rising rhythm that of ten syllables, accented on the sixth and tenth, is the oldest and most frequent. It is the epic line of assonanced French poetry and appears, though infrequently, in the early lyric. It was also a favorite verse in Provençal, and in Italy has been so generally employed (the hendeca-syllable being the ten syllable with feminine ending) that it is very likely a native of the soil and not, as has been claimed, an immigrant from France. But in Spanish and Portuguese it is an importation from abroad. The line of eight syllables is also a great favorite in both North and South France, being the established verse for didactic and narrative poetry, and for the poems of the Breton cycle. It is rarely assonanced. Outside of France it is not so much in use.

Both these lines have in modern times given

over the larger part of their poetical possessions in French to the twelve syllable verse, having the mediate accent on the sixth. In the fifteenth century, probably, the name "Alexandrian" was applied to this line, and perhaps the term was due more to the many sequels of the poem on Alexander than to that poem itself. The line itself appears by the end of the eleventh century, and is the ordinary verse of the rimed epic poems. Elsewhere it is but sparingly employed. It went out of style in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but was revived by the Pleiade and became later the standard verse of drama and the higher poetry. In Provençal, however, it was not admired and in Italy it is seen hardly at all in artistic poetry, though from its use by Cielo d'Alcamo and in folk songs one may suppose it was indigenous there and not, as in Provence and Spain, borrowed from the French.

The line of twelve syllables having accents on the fourth and eighth is rare in mediæval poetry, but is quite a favorite in the French Romantic school of poets. The verse of six syllables is everywhere rare. It occurs more in Italy (see Brunetto Latini) than elsewhere, and is occasionally found in France, as in Philippe de Thaan. Verses of four and two syllables are lyric and infrequent.

While the verses with rising rhythm are the rule in France and Italy, those of a falling rhythm are found mainly in Spain and Portugal. That of fourteen syllables with accented seventh is used by William IX. of Poitou in his Provençal songs, and is in Spain the ordinary verse of the ballad poetry and drama. But it is generally printed in two lines of seven syllables each, notwithstanding the absence of rime at every other line. In this verse was written also the 'Poema del Cid.'

Related to the line of fourteen syllables is that of ten syllables having an accent at the fifth. This is also a favorite in the Peninsula, and is also generally printed in two lines. We find it as the customary verse of the lyric romances in Spain, and it was likewise in good repute among the Troubadours. Mediæval French was not entirely ignorant of it. The eleven syllable verse with accented seventh is also frequent in Spanish and was

known to Provençal. The nine syllable verse, a shortened form of the eleven, is rare, but is to be found in all the Romance territory. More frequent is the seven syllable line, the independent part of the epic line in Spain, and occasionally met with in Italy and France, as in 'Aucassin et Nicolette.' Also an independent half (of the ten syllable verse) is the five syllable line of Spanish and Portuguese poetry. Elsewhere it is hardly to be found, save in Roumanian. Lines of three and one syllables are very few and are to be considered rather as tricks in versification, than as genuine poetical measures.

Since the appearance of Romance poetry in the Middle Ages, there has been but little development either in the number or the kind of its verses. Certain changes have taken place in the case of tonic syllables and at the end of the rhythmical divisions, notably the dropping of the tonic syllable at the cesura, or its incorporation into the last half of the line. Thus, as in Italian, this fixed place of the accented syllable being done away with, changes arise in the laws for rime and for the form of strophes. Accordingly, the next division of Stengel's study is concerned with the problem of these changes. It begins with the modifications in the fixed number of syllables.

As we well know, in enumerating the syllables in a verse, the French, and the Provençal as well, make no account of the atonic syllable following the last tonic in the line, and in the early poetry this was the case with the atonic syllable at a cadence of the rhythmical divisions within the line. The Italian, however, counts the final atonic, provided there is but one, and the Spanish and Portuguese do the same. Nowadays, it is not so easy to determine the number of syllables in a line as it was in the Middle Ages, for poets like to preserve old forms of words, to introduce strange forms and also to adopt local pronunciations.

Also there were no rules of euphony in mediæval French. With few exceptions hiatus was permitted, as well within the same word (between its separate syllables) as between consecutive words. Nor were diphthongs known to early French. In modern French, on the other hand, a much more complex

state of affairs exists, which has been brought about mainly by the growing dislike to hiatus, and at the present time by the fashion of imitating vulgar ways of speaking. The Italians, to avoid hiatus, have been content with slurring strongly the vowels which come in contact with each other. The methods of the Spaniards, however, have not been sufficiently looked into for one to arrive at definite conclusions, but in Portuguese, at first, there was little prejudice against hiatus, though latterly vowel slurring has become common. Mediæval Provençal resembles the French of the same period, while in Roumanian the usage is still uncertain. So, in general, a considerable discrimination is to-day necessary to determine how many syllables a given line may contain.

Passing to the question of the tonic syllables, Stengel has already shown that each line has at least one. He believes also that the line of four syllables in Italian has two, but that no other line has as many until we reach the verse of eight syllables. The first accent of this verse, which comes on the fourth syllable, may indeed be replaced by an atonic syllable, and, inasmuch as there is no pause at this stressed syllable, the very existence of an accent there has been denied. But the oldest examples of the verse certainly show an accent, and thereby furnish a proof for the statement made above, that accent had formerly more weight in Romance versification than it has to-day. On the contrary, the lines of ten and twelve syllables still retain the accent within the verse and show a pause after it, though in the Italian hendeca-syllable this pause has been abolished, thus changing the fixed tonic syllable into a moveable one. A certain kind of twelve syllable verse has three accents, and the nine and eleven have a like number, or at least had, for in early times the eleven syllable verse accented the third and seventh, but later the fifth only, doing away with the former two. So the fourteen syllable verse had as many as four accents, but afterward surrendered those on the third and tenth, and retained only the one on the seventh syllable.

Not all of these accented syllables were followed by a pause, and, as a fact, within the

verse there is but one genuine pause, so that lines containing two or more accents within the line had but one accent, which was strengthened by a pause, or cesura. This term, of course, borrowed from the Latins, is rejected by Stengel as misleading. For it he substitutes the word *Reihenschluss*, which seems to have no convenient English equivalent. Therefore, let it suffice, once for all, to say that by cesura in Romance poetry is meant that accent which coincides with the pause within the verse. The different varieties of cesura are, consequently, due to the double requirement of the pause and of the word accent, which is attached to some definite syllable of the verse. In attempting to satisfy this requirement it must, first of all, be kept in mind that the atonic syllables which follow the pause are not counted. But a proparoxytonic ending is, as we have seen, frequent only in Spanish and Portuguese; in Italian it is rare. The common cesura in the former languages is the paroxytonic, and in Italian also it often occurs, while it is not at all unusual in the earliest epic poems in French. From this last fact Diez named it the "epic" cesura. Lyric poetry always avoided this ending, and in the fourteenth century it began to be neglected, in France, by the other kinds of verses also, so that in the sixteenth the budding treatises on prosody condemned it formally, though it was still in occasional use.

On the contrary, that cesura which has been named by Diez the "lyric," is formed by replacing the tonic syllable preceding it with an atonic, so that the word-accent falls on the second syllable before the pause. For instance, in the verse of ten syllables the third or fifth are accented instead of the fourth or sixth. By this transfer of word-accent the pause is less strongly marked, for it remains in the same place as at first, yet it has lost the help given it by the word-accent. This transfer, however, took place in French and Provençal alone. In French poetry the lyric cesura held its own fairly well until Marot's time. Then it disappeared.

A third kind of cesura cuts through the line at such a place that the atonic ending is separated by it from the first rhythmical division, and is thus prefixed to the second. At least,

this appears to be the case on the surface; but, in fact, the pause itself is done away with while the word-accent is retained. Like this kind is the weak cesura of the Italian hendecasyllable and its imitations in Spanish and Portuguese. It is found also in Provençal and in French, down to the time of Marot.

Still another variety is the archaic cesura of the ten syllable verse, where the sixth syllable of the line is accented and is followed by the pause, instead of the fourth. In historical times this cesura, which Stengel considers to be the primitive one, has been but little used. It is found, however, in localities widely separated in both France and Italy, and is employed in many kinds of poetry. It is evidently the original cesura of the often cited 'Vita Faronis,' that Latin version of a Romance song in the ninth century. Remnants of it are, without a doubt, to be seen in the rimeless six syllable verses at the end of the epic *laissez* in the cycle of William of Orange. These would be the independent first part of this line. Two of the oldest French *romances* use it, and it is found in several other early lines and poems. Among moderns, Voltaire has tried to revive it in French.

The discussion of the cesura in this typical verse leads Stengel to some interesting remarks on the subject of the French laws for poetical syntax. For he sees in this line of ten syllables the starting-point of the later rule, which insisted that the thought should coincide with the divisions of the verse and that overflow is inconsistent with French Prosody. The pause in this line after the sixth syllable, and the fact that the first division is found standing by itself, would prove the original independence of each of the two parts. Therefore, each part must have been at first the expression of some complete thought, and the union of the two must have arisen from a desire to express a more extended opinion. And so the law against overflow at the cesura and verse ending has its foundation in the history of French poetry, though this tradition is not always observed either in the older or later verse.

Though it seems clear to the author that the above is the true explanation of the law mentioned, still he admits that the syntactical

treatment of the first division of the verse in French mediæval and pre-renaissance literature is quite uncertain. And it is also evident, in opposition to his general statement, that in early poetry both the syntactical and rhythmical cesura was often disregarded, and that in later times this practice has been followed by the Romantic school, in its attack on the rules for verse laid down by the seventeenth century. In South France the syntactic cesura was never so strongly marked as in the North, while in Italy, as well as in Spain and Portugal, there was, of course, no reason to observe it at all. The idea as advanced by Stengel is decidedly attractive, and in developing it in detail there is abundant material for many doctors' dissertations.

The ending of the whole verse follows the same law of syntax as that of its first division, and so much the more because the verse has naturally a more noticeable pause at the end than it has within the line. Hence, feminine endings of the verse have remained in French and Provençal, and are the rule in the other Romance literatures. The lyric ending spoken of above is found only among the Anglo-Norman poets and the Troubadours, and the weak ending, technically called "overflow," is rare, excepting in the case of short lines. But the French were not content with the natural recurrence of feminine endings. In their earliest poetry (that which was sung) there was no regularity of endings observed. But later, when poetry was composed to be read, there arose the custom of alternating masculine and feminine endings, possibly under Provençal influence. This custom began at the end of the thirteenth century, and the rhetoricians of the early sixteenth make it obligatory. From that time on it has continued in full sway, excepting in the poems of Théodore de Banville and among the Symbolists. Still, when the pronunciation of the present day is taken into consideration, we see that most of the so-called feminines are, in fact, masculine. Spanish and Italian prefer the feminine ending, though in the latter language *tronco* and *sdrucchiolo* rimes are allowed under pressure.

The stronger pause at the end of the verse, which exists to-day, was at first, perhaps, less

marked than the pause after the first rhythmical division. But the prejudice against overflow has been more apparent in historical times, at the former ending than at the latter, and the admission of overflow by the French poets of the sixteenth century was due, probably, to outside influences, notably to Latin models. At the end of that period the traditional law resumed its favor. In the question of overflow, the Provençals are like the French, while the Italians and Spaniards allow greater liberty.

The next subject, after the usages observed in the making of the separate lines, is that of joining the lines together. Stengel remarks on the few instances of alliteration in Romance poetry—the most primitive of poetical ties—and takes up the derivation of assonance, which he, true to his principle, considers to be the continuation of the assonance which existed in popular Latin. In French poetry assonance gave way in the twelfth century to rime, yet the latter shows its parentage even at the present day by its insistence on rime between the tonic vowels, rather than between consonants, as in Germanic poetry. Among the Troubadours, assonance changed to rime earlier than in North France, and in Italy it can scarcely be found at all. In Portugal assonance is in favor, and in Spain it is the universal rime, used in the higher styles of poetry no less than in the lower. Assonance in contradistinction to rime indicates popular poetry and shows in its employment but little artistic variation. Its chief aim is to give exact likeness in quality between the tonic vowels, and consequently simple vowels rarely assonance with diphthongs, or with nasal vowels, though the revision of manuscripts by successive generations of copyists makes absolute verification of these principles impossible. However, it is certain that assonance is employed almost wholly between the tonic vowels at the end of verses, only one or two instances of assonance between successive cesuras having been found.

As assonance yielded to rime the assonanced epic *laisses* changed to rimed *laisses*, and afterwards separated into rimed couplets. Early rime consisted in likeness of sound alone, but afterwards likeness in the spelling

of the tonic syllables was also demanded. It was in the Middle Ages, too, that rich rime made its appearance, evidently through the influence of Latin rhythmical poetry, and its use naturally became more frequent in the case of masculine endings than in the case of feminines. So, outside of French and Provençal, rich rime is not often employed in Romance versification. In the thirteenth century, there arose in North France a passion for artistic rimes, which lasted until the sixteenth century, and which produced those curious plays on words and marvellous terminations of verses which have made the poetry of that period a synonym for fantastic and puerile versification. These rimes Stengel considers, each in its turn, and offers certain apt suggestions, as, for instance, to name the *rime couronnée* "assonance-rime." Provençal poetry also allows rich rime, yet its more ambitious poets preferred equivocal rime to rich, and especially the *rims cars*, which consists of unusual words. The other Romance peoples gained from the Troubadours their knowledge of rich and unusual rimes.

Other kinds of rime include rime between the endings of successive rhythmical divisions, or between these and the verse ending, the *vers batelés*. Such unusual rimes often separated a long line into several short ones. In Provençal the poets were fond of a sequence of rimes, extending through the whole poem, in which the tonic syllables followed the order of vowels in the alphabet. Grammatical rime was also practised by the Troubadours, and by the French as well. But both the simple and complex systems of rimes agreed in the number of lines which they bound together. These could vary from two in didactic and narrative poetry to long *laissez*, as in the epic. From these longer unions developed, with the aid of artistic rimes, several primitive forms of strophes. Mingling lines of different lengths was frequent in mediæval poetry, as well as in the modern. We can cite an extreme example of this mixture—the *vers libres* of La Fontaine.

But this last topic naturally introduces the whole question of strophic forms, which is one of the most difficult questions in Romance poetry, and consequently one which has been

most neglected by writers in the field. This is a pity, for the development of strophes is one of the greatest achievements of Romance poetry, and its most important contribution to the world's literature. It is also original with the Romance nations and not at all due to Latin models. Musical themes and variations appear to have been the occasion of strophe building. Therefore, the first requisite in a poem was that all its strophes should be musically similar, and that their verses should agree rhythmically. According to the nature of the melody, so the inner structure of the strophe would vary, and as long as music was the formative principle of the poem, so long there existed a greater freedom in the make-up of the strophes. They need not, when sung, be so exactly alike, provided they satisfied the requirements of the musical theme, which were to make the accents correspond exactly. These verses could vary greatly in the actual number of their syllables.

The length of the strophes could vary also, so long as they were sung, and we know how the epic *laissez* differed from one another in length. Possibly, at first, all the *laissez* of a poem were in the same assonance, as examples of poems having but one rime would seem to indicate, but most of the narrative and didactic poetry of France had, in fact, no strophic form at all.

It is also by the aid of music that the probable primitive form of the strophe is arrived at. This form was quite certainly the mere repetition of a solo verse by a chorus, very much as it was in the former rendering of our hymns by the "deaconing-off" process, though in the latter case the lines were read by the soloist instead of sung. Therefore, the first strophe consisted of two lines identically the same. This view of the original form of a strophe as proceeding from one line seems to be borne out by various popular refrains and poems based, apparently, on such repetitions. When the repetition by the chorus was limited to the repetition of the first line of the solo, instead of each line in succession, this line became prominent and separated from the body of the poem. Therefore, the line which was always repeated, and which is now called the refrain, is not at all a musical modulation

in its origin, but the typical line of the poem. The practice of employing also a new refrain for each new song would induce the poet to vary his musical theme, and thus would occasion new forms of verse, new assonances and rimes, and finally, new strophic forms. In regard to the varying of the rime, Stengel believes that it was done by the soloist rather than by the chorus, in other words, that the refrain is the real form of the first line of a poem. To show this, he takes a refrain, cited by Jeanroy from Rolland's collection :

Mon Dieu, quel homme, quel petit homme,
Mon Dieu, quel homme, qu'il est petit !

The second line would be really the form of the first, so that the soloist has changed his verse ending in order to rime with the cesura, and there results instead of a⁸ A⁸ the scheme a4 a4 a4 b4, which could thus easily change to a4 a4 b4 b4. Also a⁸ A⁸ could change, by separating the lines and riming the divisions together, to a4 b4 a4 b4. Rimes between the rhythmical divisions could separate a long line into three shorter ones, and give rise to the scheme a a b which could then be repeated.

Thus by the action of the refrain on the original form of the strophe, and by the separation of the long lines into their rhythmical divisions, the uniformity of the poem is broken up, and the ground prepared for the future changes which suggested themselves to the artistic poets. So the three divisions of the strophe in court poetry would have their origin in the scheme a a b (or a b a) above produced, and the whole process of the development of the many forms of Romance strophe would be entirely due to the inborn instinct and tastes of the Romance peoples. After the formative process had reached its maturity influences from without modified it, to be sure, but never altered its traditional structure.

The refrain, therefore, is the outgrowth of the strophe and can be truly called a component part of it, at least in popular poetry and in the poetry of primitive peoples. Therefore, we find it not only at the end of the strophe, but also at the beginning and even within the strophe. But the earliest poems preserved show that the refrain had already become a separate and independent part of

the strophe, and the court poets so far considered it unessential as to omit it altogether or, as in Portuguese, to fuse it with the main body of the strophe. Thus neglected, the refrain soon lost its importance and was reduced in length, until it became often but a single word, the final word of the strophe. Yet certain kinds of poem reveal the early importance of the refrain. The *sestina* is based on the alternation of refrains, and the Provençal *rims estramps* is the survival of an original refrain. To the refrain the *envoi*, which is the refrain of the whole poem instead of the individual strophes of the poem, owes its existence—appearing first among the Troubadours. We have seen that the half lines at the end of epic *laisses* are not thought by Stengel to be refrains, but independent rhythmical divisions, and he would make the rest of the line to be filled out with a musical flourish. A musical refrain would be also the *Aoi* of 'Roland,' and words like it in use.

Out of the monorime stanza of three lines, which first appear in lyric poetry, the strophe grew by various additions and separations of long lines, and by mingling lines of different lengths. At first, all the lines observed the same rime, whatever their lengths. Generally, but two kinds of verse are mingled together, and the Italians rarely pass this limit. The Troubadours, however, and more seldom the other Romance nations, mix three and more kinds of verse. Such elaborate compositions were, of course, only possible after poetry had ceased to be written for musical themes. Together with the complexity of the strophe the original monorime was varied, and gave way to many simple and intricate ways of riming as the strophe grew in length. In regard to syntax, the notion that the strophe should coincide with the complete expression of a thought, or rather that the thought should coincide with the strophe, prevailed generally, but more so in Italy than elsewhere. In mediæval Provençal, this view was carried to such an extreme that the strophes often became entirely independent of one another in sense, and were, practically, so many separate poems. But in modern French poetry strophic overflow is not unusual.

The concluding division of Stengel's article

considers some popular forms of poetry which have become fixed and subject to rules. These forms occur, of course, only in lyric verse. The *descort* and *lai*, also the *motet*, belong all to that kind of poem which consists of strophes unlike one another. They are all, undoubtedly, imitations of the Latin sequences of the Middle Ages. But the poems which have a fixed form, and are of purely Romance origin, are the most important and interesting. Among them are the sonnet, concerning the origin of which Stengel agrees with Biadene (See MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. iv, pp. 151-5), and the ballad, more complex and multiform, of which the oldest examples are in Provençal, and the primitive scheme of which Stengel would fix as BB abb BB. That is, the refrain precedes the strophe, is repeated after the ballad theme, as the final lines of the strophe, and finally follows the strophe thus built up. Under the influence of the refrain which preceded it, the first line of the refrain in the strophe was changed to the line designated here by a. A ballad in five strophes of a more popular origin, has the scheme BB a b b BB. The later ballads among the Troubadours, as well as in Italy and Northern France, show the similarity of the beginning of the refrain with the ending of the strophe. In Northern France the word *balete* was at first the name for the popular ballad. The word *balade* is found in Nicole de Margival's 'Dit de la Panthère,' and is a loan from Provençal. The original scheme of the ballad would appear to be a b a b c C C. The later ballad scheme a b a b b c b C is evolved from a seven syllable model a b a b b c C by doubling the refrain and uniting the first line of it to the strophe, and by changing afterwards its rime. Ballads of three strophes—the strophe varies in length in different poems—having a one-line refrain and an *envoi*, became the fashion in the fourteenth century in France, were in even greater favor in the fifteenth, and declined only under the disdain of the Pleiade. In Italy, Dante and Petrarch wrote ballads more like the Provençal and early French in their lines and rimes.

In contrast with the great uncertainty of ballad form is the definite form of the *rondel*, which has but one strophe, and has the refrain at the beginning, within the strophe and at the

end. Evidently, in the *rondel*, the chorus sang alternating with the soloist, while in the ballad the chorus came in only at the end of the melody. The simplest *rondel* would be A¹ A² a A¹ a A¹ A², which shows a refrain of two lines, and an imitation and repetition for the first line of the refrain for the strophe. So the length of the *rondel* depends on the length of the refrain. The *rondel*, which means a round dance, seems to have been purely French in origin and in use. Its first name was *rondet*. Adam de la Halle was especially fond of the form, under the name of *rondel*, and it continued in high favor down to the rise of the Pleiade. Rondeau and triolet are but other names for fixed schemes of the same poem.

Based on the *rondel*, and developments and modifications of it, were various other forms of pre-renaissance verse, both French and Provençal, as the *bergerette*, the *virelai*, the *dansa* and the Portuguese *vilancete*. The *bergerette* belongs to the school of Charles d'Orléans. It substitutes, for the repetition of the refrain in the strophe, lines which differ from the refrain in words and rime only, and not in length or in rhythm. The *virelai* is merely a *bergerette* of several strophes, and the refrain is repeated in it only after the last strophe.

With these remarks on the poetical forms created by Romance versification, Stengel brings his study to a close. He has not wasted many words in the exposition of his views, and this abstract of them merely repeats his points without improving in the least on the original. Indeed, in the restatement of Stengel's position on the development of the strophe, and again, on the evolution of the ballad, your reviewer is not certain that it has been exactly understood by him. The seeker after truth can, however, verify the whole at his leisure.

It was the intention, when this review was begun to compare the points made by Stengel with other works on the subject, especially with the notes furnished by Paul Meyer's lectures on Romance versification, which were given some years since in the Collège de France, and with Jeanroy's 'Les origines de la poésie lyrique en France,' both of which

authorities Stengel repeatedly mentions. But to have carried out such a comparison, would have increased this already extended notice to a length which would have proven wearisome to the most patient reader. So we will be content with recalling such opinions of our author as seem to be novel and suggestive, and which are stated the more clearly and confidently. These include the caution against partisanship in the question of the priority of lines and forms, which has been occasioned by the greater attention which the French side has received; the unambiguous statement that it is a fixed number of syllables rather than of accents (in the English meaning of the term), which is the underlying principle of the Romance verse,—wherein we see the tendency towards set rules of prosody, and that desire for law and authority which characterizes the heirs of Rome—; the general classification of all Romance verses into verses subjected to a rising, and verses governed by a falling rhythm, and all the consequences which result from this division; the relation of verse-pause to word-accent, a most attractive chapter in this study; the archaic cesura of the verse of ten syllables, and the rule of syntax which resulted from such a division; the evolution of the strophe from responsive singing; and many other views only less ingenious and attractive. And it is to be remembered also, that Stengel's starting-point for his whole discussion is that Romance versification is throughout (saving in minor details) of popular rather than of learned origin. In this position he is more confident, and looks back farther into history for proof than any other writer on the subject has done, whose opinion he may share and whose position he so thoroughly defends.

F. M. WARREN.

Adelbert College.

ITALIAN LITERATURE.

GIUSEPPE CASTELLI: *La vita e le opere di Cecco d'Ascoli*. Bologna: Zanichelli. 1892. 4^{to}, pp. 287.

FRANCESCO degli Stabili, or Cecco d'Ascoli, as he is called, enjoyed a very wide reputation as a poet during the fourteenth and fifteenth

centuries. The large number of MSS. of his 'Acerba' still preserved in the libraries of Italy and elsewhere, are ample proof of this. His fame is not due so much, perhaps, to the intrinsic merit of his poem, the 'Acerba,' which is a sort of compendium of the knowledge of the time, in the manner of Brunetto Latini's 'Tesoro,' as to the fact that he spoke disparagingly of Dante and his 'Commedia,' and that he was burned at the stake by the Inquisition. In fact Sig. Castelli (p. 171) says:

"If the memory of Cecco d'Ascoli has not entirely perished; if a part of his literary and scientific labor has been able to resist the attacks of enemies rising up from generation to generation, as though called upon by hereditary vengeance, this is due to the relation between the Ascolan and Dante, through which, even in our own days, he continues to be reviled."

Gaspary, one of the latest of Cecco's critics, says this of him:

"Fazio degli Uberti is an enthusiastic admirer of Dante; quite the contrary is another poet, who, much older than Fazio, had been in personal relations with the author of the *Commedia*, that is to say, Francesco di Simone Stabili of Ascoli, or as he is generally called, Cecco d'Ascoli. He called his poem, written about 1326, *L'Acerba*; it is a question what he intended to say by this; but it is very probable that he meant by it *l'opera acerba*, because of the difficulty of the matters contained therein. The poem, with its frequent obscurities, agrees only too well with its title. Cecco manifestly considered his *Acerba* as something superior to the *Commedia*: for directly at the beginning and frequently thereafter, whenever he finds an opportunity, he attacks Dante; denies that he has ever been in Paradise as he sings; that instead, his little faith rather lead him into Hell, and that he remained there and never again returned. In the fervor of his polemic, Cecco never even took the trouble to understand the man whom he criticised, as when he reproves him (ii., 1) for having put everything on this earth subject to Fortune, and defends, against him, the free will of the rational soul, which can overcome the influence of the stars; as if Dante had not been of the very same opinion; or, when he accuses him of never having known *il vero amore*, because in a Sonnet to Cino da Pistoia he declared it possible to change one's affection, etc."¹

But whatever the world may think of Cecco d'Ascoli as a poet, it cannot well withhold its

¹ 'Storia della Letteratura Italiana.' (Torino, 1887), Vol. i, p. 299.